

First Steering Committee meeting – Summary of Residential Working Group meetings

James River and Its Tributaries - Water Quality Improvement Plan for Bacteria Impairments

1:00 PM, January 12, 2011

1408 Westover Hills Blvd.
Richmond, 23225

Brainstorm Session (11/16/10):

- I. Residential BMPs which are most deserving of consideration and would achieve the most success in terms of community buy-in and successful reduction of bacteria (top priority):
 - a. Pet waste-pickup program – community / neighborhood associations to sponsor
 - b. Septic repair program and education program for homeowners
 - c. Stormwater BMPs – including any and all types in the CSO watersheds to reduce the frequency of CSOs.
 - d. Education program for citizens with irrigation system to include proper use.
 - e. Rain barrels
 - f. Initiation of Pet waste clean-up program – at citizen, community association, and locality levels
 - g. Repair Septic failures / Sewer line leaks
 - h. Initiate building code changes in order for green infrastructure and LEED development / projects to move forward.
 - i. Tree planting
- II. BMPs which may be too difficult to implement (\$/codes):
 - a. Regulation of irrigation practices
 - b. Green roofs (retrofits are especially expensive)
 - c. Green alleys

1st Residential WG Session (12/13/10):

- I. Review of Septic/Sewer Estimates (from TMDL and based on final scenarios by Creek)
 - a. Group not confident that numbers were accurate. Group expressed their lack of confidence in the estimates which were derived from Census data.
 - b. Group agreed that a “sewer-connection” BMP was necessary. Representative from the City of Richmond said would be the biggest bang-for the buck in terms of bacteria reduction (for current or future failures). Chesterfield has consulted with VDH and is developing a pilot area in order to recommend numbers of homes to connect to sewer in impaired watersheds. City has expressed some interest but cited difficulties in regard to what VDH has in terms of permitted septs and what they have in number of water connections but no sewer connections. Henrico did not mention if they would pursue estimates for a sewer-connection BMP.
- II. Review of Pet Waste Composter/Education Program Estimates:
 - a. Group requested a more succinct definition of “Pet waste education program” – group didn’t think the cost estimate of \$3500 would be appropriate for a large-scale program which a locality might undertake and might be too much for something which a homeowner association might pursue. Should have different levels and costs to use as a guide and costs will be different in among the different impairments in the watershed.
 - b. Given that there are a number of pet-cleanup stations throughout the City of Richmond, Henrico and Chesterfield, the facilitator suggested that these localities provide information on

the number of these stations and what they paid for install and how they are maintained. This could help with the IP development of pet-waste BMPs.

- c. Some group members expressed doubt that the pet composters would be beneficial. Unless a survey is done its impossible to know if they are being used or providing a benefit once the homeowner has installed them on their property.